



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

FURTHER NOTES ON THE JEWS OF ANGEVIN ENGLAND.

(Continued from JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, IV.)

JEWISH BUSINESS AND DEEDS.—It is possible from the materials given by the records to obtain a tolerably clear idea of the way in which the Jews conducted their business of usury. In several instances we have an extremely full account of the whole history of a transaction or set of transactions, *e.g.* those of Richard Anesty, in Palgrave's *Commonwealth of England*, ii., pp. xxiv.-xxvii., of the Abbey of St. Edmond's, in Joce de Brakelond's *Cronica*, Cam. Soc., pp. 2-4, or of Benedict Pernaz, in Madox, *Formulare Anglicanum*, p. 77. We can in these cases trace the whole course of a debt from its beginning to the final payment to the Jews or to the King.

It may be safely said that the only persons in the Kingdom in want of coined money were of the upper classes, *i.e.*, the nobles, gentry, and clergy. The vast mass of the people lived by barter, and had no need of coin. But the smaller nobles and gentry, if they wished to conduct a law-suit, or equip their retainers, or go on a crusade or build a castle—and no less than 1,115 of these were constructed in Stephen's reign—or erect a church, would have to get money from the Jews, who were the only large holders of it in the Kingdom. There were a few Christians who lent money without interest, *e.g.*, William Fitz Isabel was the largest creditor of the Abbey of St. Edmond's (Brakelond, *l.c.*), but for the most part resort had to be made to the Jew.

NOTE.—As before, numbers are to the items from the Pipe Rolls in *Archæol. Res.*, Feb. 1889, pagination to my forthcoming *Jews of Angevin England*.

As a general rule the security was good, *i.e.* landed property, but this was of little use to the Jew, who could not hold it under an overlord. The aim of the Jew, therefore, was to get a ready money return of some sort, chiefly of course the rent of the land usually paid by the vassals of the debtor. In one case, and that the earliest on record, the money was to be returned in the form of so many soams of hay, which was a very marketable commodity: in this case no mention is made of usury, though probably the value of the hay was higher than that of the money lent. Similarly we have frequent mention of loans to be repaid in a series of years without any payment of usury if the instalments are paid up to date. In such cases we may suspect that the sum mentioned in the deed and to be repaid was really much more than the sum lent (*cf.* remarks in Round, *Ancient Deeds*, Pipe Roll Soc., n. 82). Generally, however, usury is to be paid straightway, as in the case of Richard Anesty. The amount of usury varies from twopence in the pound per week (*i.e.* about 43 per cent. per annum) to fourpence (*i.e.* 86 per cent.), while a penny and threepence also occur.

But this high rate seems only to have been current when the Jew did not have his pledge and mortgage. It naturally soon led to a state of affairs where the payment of interest became intolerable, and the debtor found it necessary to make a fine with the Jew, *i.e.*, capitalise the interest, add the principal, and start afresh. He might do this either allowing interest again to accrue (as was done at St. Edmond's), or for a time the Jew could collect the rents till the whole was paid off (187), or the estate was saddled with a yearly rent to the Jew till the debt could be paid off. In this case the interest on the capitalised sum was to be ably moderate; $12\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., $13\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. (Round, *l.c.*), 10 per cent. (p. 188), $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. (Hall, *Court Life, Hen. II.*, p. 231), though in case of non-payment of the interest stringent conditions are imposed.

But things did not always go so smoothly in the arrange-

ment of a long-standing debt. Merely to have his right to a debt recognised, the Jew had often to recur to the King's courts (see *Contributions*, §§ 15—27), as also for a writ to remind his debtor. When the debtor failed to pay and incurred forfeiture of his land, the Jew had often to get the King's court to give him seisin or possession (27, 69), or applied for an assize of novel disseisin (65). Legal aid was also at times required to ensure a Jew being recognised as the owner of a piece of land (90), or to have right against the estate of a deceased debtor (153). And when the courts declared for the Jew their assistance had to be invoked to have the goods of a debtor distrained (181).

It is clear from the above that there was nothing against the Jews holding land, at least in the twelfth century. The records for that period are not at all full; my extracts are probably not complete; we only get information as a rule when there is some legal dispute about the property. Yet with all this I have been able to draw up a list of manors¹ on which Jews held liens, running to over eighty, in almost all parts of the country.

The striking thing about this list is the predominance of Aaron of Lincoln: exactly half of the entries refer to him. This is due to some extent to the fact that his estates fell into the King's hands, and therefore were enrolled on the King's records. But it was precisely because of their magnitude that the King kept them in his own possession, instead of passing them on for a consideration to Aaron's son Vives. It is clear on all hands that Aaron was the leading financier of his time. His treasure, which was lost in the Channel, must have been very large, and he left besides nearly £20,000 worth of indebtedness (including the Cistercian debt) which passed to the King. And there are certain indications which show in what way his

¹ When expressly mentioned as mortgaged. It is probable that many of the manors which gave names to the Jews' debtors were also pledged. But of this we cannot be certain.

huge wealth was acquired. He organised the Jewry in the sense of making all the Jews throughout the country his loan-agents. Thus Solomon of Paris signs a receipt for his master Aaron; Peytevin and Leo are only his attorneys. As early as 1166 we find him doing business (obviously through agents) in Lincoln, Norfolk, Yorkshire, Hants, Essex, Rutland, Cambridge, Oxford, and Bucks. His example was followed by Isaac fil Rabbi, whom we find in partnership with him (24), for we find Benedict Bressus receiving money on behalf of Isaac. The whole body of Jews were banded together in one banking corporation, trading in a few names, like Aaron of Lincoln, Isaac fil Rabbi, Jurnet of Norwich, and Brun of London.

They were not, however, allowed by the King to have partnerships. Jurnet and Isaac tried to do so, but were not allowed (23). The reason is tolerably obvious. When one of the partners died, debts due to the firm would not fall into the King's hands, as would be the case with an ordinary debt due to a single Jew who happened to die. And it was to the interest of the debtor that the debt should fall into the King's hands, for he might then compound for the debt at a much smaller sum than was owed to the Jew. It was doubtless for this reason that debtors were willing to pay such high interest: if the Jew died before payment was enforced, the debtor might escape for a much smaller sum paid to the King. It was, as I have said, a kind of bet taken against the life of the Jew, and the York massacres were in this sense a huge case of "nobbling." On the other hand, it was better business for the King, in the long run, to pass on the indebtedness to another Jew (125, 130), for while in the King's hands it bore no interest.

For this last reason, no obstacles seem to have been placed in the way of Jews passing on debts from one to another (*cf.* 113, 164, 215, 218). In this way a certain amount of transactions in credit must have gone on, corresponding in a measure with the stock and share markets

of later times. The deeds of indebtedness passed from one Jew to another as a medium of exchange, and thus increased the circulation. We have instances of debts to Jews in England being collected from debtors in Normandy (49); if such debts also passed from hand to hand among the Jews, we should have here the germ of bills of exchange.¹

It is by no means clear how the somewhat complicated estimates involved in the calculation of usury were formed; probably by means of an abacus (Ball, *Mathematics at Cambridge*, p. 2). Cases occur of debts being again demanded when already paid (48, *cf.* 110). To avoid such an accident debtors often had their *Shetars* or acquittances enrolled on the Pipe Roll (163*a*), or would have a general acknowledgment similarly inscribed (164*a*). The accusation of falsity of charters was frequent against the Jews in the thirteenth century, but there was scarcely any need for such means of getting the debtors in the toils. The automatic increase of interest would be sufficient by itself, and would naturally give rise to suspicion of foul play in minds unaccustomed to calculate compound interest.

The Deeds in which these various transactions were recorded were mainly of two kinds—an acknowledgment on the part of the debtor, or a release on the side of the Jew. The former were at first called simply charters (*cartæ*) or deeds, but later became known as *cyrographs*, which were in duplicate written on one piece of parchment, with the two copies of the bond separated by the word CYROGRAPHVS written large. This was then cut through with a zigzag contour, so that the two parts, on being put together, exactly tallied. This was to prevent the substitution of a different deed. The Jewish keeper of these deeds was called a cyrographer.

The receipts of the Jews were called "Stars" (*Starrum*),

¹ Dr. Simonsen, of Copenhagen, has suggested to me that the word "cambire," about the meaning of which I expressed doubts (*supra*, iv, p. 646), may mean exchange in this sense. It is, however, difficult to see in what sense it could be made a crime. See *infra*, p. 77.

after the Hebrew *Shetar*, or "contract." As is well known, the Court of Star Chamber of later times is supposed to have derived its name from being held in the chamber where the old Jewish Starrs used to be deposited. This is to some extent confirmed by the fact that the folk-etymology of the name refers it to an imaginary sky-blue ceiling adorned with stars, of which there is no evidence. It was Blackstone who first suggested the other etymology.

Besides these deeds specially devoted to Jewish debts, we find Jews concerned in others of a more general character. Thus we find Jurnet of Norwich occurring in one of the earliest "Feets of Fine." This is a record of a fictitious action between landlord and tenant, so as to put on record the transaction by which the land or house changed hands. But such deeds and others like them, as mortgages or covenants, have nothing specifically Jewish. They are merely "common form" of the period, such as are to be found in the usual law books of the time, by Glanville or Fleta.

JEWISH CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE TREASURY.—The sources of the King's income in Angevin England were of an extremely miscellaneous character. Almost every event in the life of an Englishman might be the occasion of claiming money for him. The classical treatise of Thomas Madox, *The History of the Exchequer*, 1707, thus goes over a large section of the whole of English life. It was the same with Englishmen of Jewish faith; their payments to the Exchequer were multifarious in the extreme. It has been usual to refer to this as evidence that the King's power was absolute over them, that they were his chattels. But for nearly every one of the payments made by an English Jew I can produce evidence of similar fines, etc., made by other Englishmen. The chief exceptions are payments for Escuage, Ferms, Aids, and Customs, though the Dona and Tallages of the Jews may be said to correspond to Aids. I have drawn up the following list of the various occasions

on which we find Jews paying the Royal Treasury during the period under review, following as far as possible the order of Madox's treatment, and placing in brackets the chapter and section of his treatise where the same or similar exactions from ordinary Englishmen are recorded.

RELIEF, WARDSHIP, MARRIAGE [X. iv.].

[Relief was a feudal profit paid by a tenant on taking possession of his estate on the death of the previous owner. Wardship was the right of custody of a relative's children.]

(1) For a relief, 203. [x. 4.]

(2) To have debts, etc., of deceased father, 26 (£60), 55 (5 m. husband), 66 (20 m. mother), 73 (£6), 76 (15s.), 81 (2 m. father-in-law), 85 (11 m. son), 86 (20 m. husband), 101 (£500), 116 (100 m.), 119 (£5, books), 121 (700 m.) 123 (200 m.), 140 (300 m.), 162 (20 m. not relative). [x. 4.]

(3) To have custody (wardship) of children, 23, 52, 134; for King to have same, 40. [x. 4.]

(4) For marrying without licence, 15, 58 [xiii. 2]; not to wed, 10; for a bill of divorce, 38.

(5) To have half of dowry settled on wife, 118; to have dowry returned by son when husband is dead, p. 234. [xiii. 11.]

FINES [XI.-XIII.].

[In later legal phraseology Fines refer chiefly to final agreements for the transfer of real estate; in earlier usage the term was used for almost any kind of offering made to the King.]

(6) For waste and purpresture (encroachment on forest) 80. [xi. 1.]

(7) To have dispute about forest rights heard in King's court, 204.

[These are the only two items referring to forest rights and wrongs, showing that Jews were little concerned with hunting.]

For Law Proceedings. [XII.]

(8) To have justice, 46 [xii. 1]; to have writs for justice, 160.

(9) To have pleas, 2, 21 [xii. 2]; in common, 75; to hear plea against Jews, 43.

(10) To have inquiry whether Jew may take usury from Jew, 128; whether father died Christian, 161. [*Cf.* xii. 2.]

(11) To have agreement heard, 195; dispute heard, 204.

(12) To have summons before Chief Justice instead of Justices in Eyre, 91.

(13) To have case between Jews heard in King's court, 98.

(14) To have respite of plea, 38, 146, p. 211 [xii. 4]; between Jews, 34, 50.

For Debts. [XII. v.]

[Here, as natural, we have the larger number of cases which cannot be paralleled from Madox.]

(15) To have right to recover debts, 32 (25 per cent. paid King), 49 (in Normandy), 55 *bis* (12 per cent.), 60 (50), 61 (30), 78, 99*b* (18), 113 *bis* (33, 54), 126 (33), 132 *ter* (22, 30, 20), 153 (13.3), 156 *bis* (10, 9), 158 (11), 191, 192, 194, 195 (16 per cent.), 197. [xii. 5.]

(16) To have right to recover debt against Jew, 64 (400 per cent. paid to King), 94 (14 per cent.), 147 (50 per cent.), 152 (250 per cent.).

(17) To have debts, 14, 48*a*, 51, 54, 79 (and chattels), 94 (and pledges) 171, 191, 192. [xiii. 6.]

(18) To have help to recover debt, 4, 5 [xiii. 6]; to have debtor distrained, 181.

(19) To have writ to recover debt, 113, p. 202 [xiii. 9]; to remind debtor, p. 200.

(20) To have right against estate of deceased debtor, 153.

(21) To have county record of debt against Jew, 160. [xii. 2.]

(22) To have mortgage, 51 *bis* [xii. 5]; to have pledge, 190; to be recognised as owner of land, 90.

(23) To have disputed mortgage kept in King's hand, 210.

(24) To get deeds from sheriff, 68; for a deed, 72.

(25) To have starrs and acquittances of deceased Jews inspected by Justices of Jews, p. 211.

(26) To have agreement with a Christian about a debt, 202.

(27) To have debts of Aaron of Lincoln, 106, 111, 125, 125*a*, 130, 135, 136, 143, 150, 163, 165, 174, 175, p. 211, 180, p. 238, 190*b*, 216; for fine to have one of his debts, 125 (500 m. for £500), 130; to have one of his houses, 125*a*, 131.

For Licences, etc. [XIII. iv.-viii.]

(28) To have an agreement among themselves, 20, 88, 199. [xiii. 4.]

(29) To have partnership, 22, 39, 83, 84 (concurrent, xiii. 13), 182. [xiii. 4.]

(30) To have residence with good-will of King, 87. [xiii. 5.]

(31) To have house bought but deprived of, 57.

(32) To have seisin of land mortgaged, 27, 69. [xiii. 8.]

For Legal Offences, etc. [XIII. ix.-xii.]

[See also Amerciaments, Nos. 37 *seq.*]

(33) To be replevied (bailed out), 126; (for burglary), 151. [xiii. 9.]

(34) To be surety, 127, 150 (for mother) [xiii. 10]; for offering money to redeem another Jew, 198.

(35) To be quits of pledges, 33 [xiii. 10]; not to be prosecuted, 88, 141 *ter*.

(36) To be quits of appeal between Jews, 35, 172, p. 200 [xiii. 11]; to be quits of a charge [*ibid.*]; to be put on oath, 154, 183; for not keeping fine, 79.

AMERCIAMENTS. [XIV.]

[When a person was found guilty of a charge he was at the King's mercy ("in misericordia"), and could only obtain this by paying an amerciament: it is often difficult to distinguish these from fines.]

(37) For an amerciament, 13 (£2,000), 28, 55 (£6,000) [xiv. 5]; fine for amerciament, 97.

(38) For killing sick man, 3 (£2,000!) [xiv. 6]; for striking knight, 45, 46; for taking off priest's cap, 72. [xiv. 15.]

(39) For personation, 57; for being party to illegal contract, 44. [xiv. 7.]

(40) For denying what he had said before, 48, 113, 133 *ter.* [xiv. 7.]

(41) For being accused of being of the society of outlaws, 145. [xiv. 7.]

(42) For lending money to men under King's displeasure, 16. [xiv. 7]; on sacred garments, 17, 53.

(43) For a novel disseisin, 65. [xiv. 8.]

(44) For a default (or forfeiture), 36. [xiv. 11.]

(45) For withdrawing from court without licence. 197, 211. [xiv. 11.]

(46) For false charge, 141. [xiv. 13.]

(47) For suborning evidence, 189*a.* [xiv. 13.]

(48) For calling warrant illegally, 99*a.* [xiv. 12.]

(49) For a stupid saying, 148 [xiv. 15]; for not having proper information in deed, 92.

(50) For buying treasure trove without permission, 93; for detaining rent of land, 91.

(51) For keeping back acquitted charters, 62; for demanding debt already paid, 48, 110.

(52) For failing to convict charter of falsity, 77; for not giving up debt to another Jew, 113.

(53) Not to be impleaded for concealing charters, 123, 146; for carrying off goods on which another Jew has sureties, 194.

(54) For lands unjustly pledged, 201; to have another Jew kept in custody for clipping, p. 233.

TALLAGE. [XVII.]

(55) Dona, 7, 9, 105 (2,000 m.), p. 162. [xvii. 2.]

(56) Tallage, Guildford, p. 88, 89, 107, 166, 167, 213, 214, 215. [xvii. 6.]

(57) Quarter of chattels, 71. [xvii. 2.]

(58) To be quit of Tallage, 89. [xvii. 7.]

It would be of interest to ascertain what was the average amount of income that the King derived from his Jewish subjects from these reliefs, fines, amerciaments, and tallages. It is, however, very difficult to ascertain this, since for a large part of the period we have no Fine Rolls, which often give information of sums paid to the King otherwise than through the Sheriffs to which the entries in the Pipe Rolls are confined. The Tallages and Dona were mainly accounted for on separate rolls and do not appear except by accident on the Pipe Rolls (there is no reference, *e.g.*, to the Northampton Donum in the Pipe Rolls). I have not given details of all my extracts from the Pipe Rolls (many more occur in the Name List) and I cannot claim to have extracted all the Jewish items. There must obviously have been more "reliefs" than the fifteen enumerated above. Altogether any estimate founded on my extracts can only profess to represent the minimum.

There is further the difficulty that we do not always know if some of the larger sums mentioned in the records were fully paid. It is certainly desirable to separate these special entries from the more ordinary items.

31	Hen. I.	Amerciament (3)	£2,000
	Hen. II.	Abraham fil Rabbi	2,000
23	"	Transfretation (29, 42)	4,066
32	"	Jurnet's fine (67)	4,000
35	"	Jurnet's licence to reside (87)	1,200
35	"	Guildford Tallage	60,000
1	Ric. I.	Cistercian fine	1,000

3 Ric. I.	Debts of Aaron (106)	£15,000
3 „	Second Thousand Marks (105)	1,366
3 „	Tallage	6,666
5 „	Northampton Donum	3,666
	Donum referred to	2,000
2 Jo.	Charters	2,666

Taking these separately, as well as the sums paid in the earlier period to Jews by the sheriffs, probably for value received by the King, we may sum up the receipts recorded in the Pipe Rolls as follows in pounds sterling.

<i>Reign.</i>	<i>Ordinary.</i>	<i>Sheriffs.</i>	<i>Special.</i>	<i>Total.</i>
Hen. I.	208	—	2,000	2,208
Hen. II. 2-36	2,030	2,702	94,300	99,030
Ric. I. 1-10	2,710	40	5,666	8,416
Jo. 1-7	350	—	2,666	3,016

It is clear that the averages for Henry II. and John are too small, the former because my extracts were less complete, the latter because the items relating to Jews had been removed to special rolls. For John's reign this is to some degree compensated for by the items from the Fine Rolls, which reach £449 for the seven years, besides £531 for the Royal Ten per Cent. for the two years, 5-7 Jo. This would seem to show that the average business of the whole English Jewry only reached £2,500 per annum, which is clearly much below the mark. The Royal Ten per Cent. only applied to debts recovered through the courts. If we could assume that about £300 per annum was the average of ordinary P. R. items, as in Ric. I., and £250 those of the Fine Rolls not extant for Henry II. and Ric. I., we should obtain something like the following revenue from Jews for the 51 years between 2 Hen. II. and Jo. 7 (1156-1206; the solitary year of Hen. I. need not be considered):—

Pipe Roll ordinary items...	£15,300
Fines and Royal Ten per Cent.	13,250
Sheriffs' payments	2,742
Special Amerciaments, Tallages, etc.	102,632
Total, ...			£1394

From this has to be subtracted £9,452 not paid and removed to Jews' Rolls by Benedict de Talemund in 10 Ric. I., and £4,500 of Aaron's debt still owing in 3 Jo., leaving a balance of almost exactly £120,000 for the 51 years. To this has to be added the unknown quantity of Aaron's cash treasure, lost in transit from England to Normandy. This would probably raise the average contribution of the Jews to the English Treasury to about £2,500 annually, and allowing for tallages, etc., not recorded during the years for which the Fine Rolls are not extant (*e.g.*, the price of the charters was probably the same in 2 Hen. II. and 2 Ric. I. as in 2 Jo., *i.e.*, 4,000 marks), we may assume, I think, that the average contribution was as near as possible £3,000 *per annum*. Taking an "index-number" of 30 for the present century this would correspond to £90,000 at present, which does not seem a very important item of the revenue. But it is probable that such an "index number" is more and more inadequate when applied to larger sums. The whole treasure left by Henry II. was only 100,000 marks, the same sum as the ransom set on King Richard (Macpherson *Annals*, 1189, 1193). Towards this sum the City of London gave or promised only 1,500 marks, the English Jewry no less than 5,000. The total trade of England was only £100,000 *per annum* (Macpherson, *l.c.*, 1208), it is nowadays 10,000 times as much. The £3,000 contributed by the Jews to the Treasury must have loomed in the eyes of the king's treasurer much more largely than perhaps a thousand times that sum in the present day.

What was the complete revenue of Angevin England? The estimate generally accepted is that of £65,000, given by Bishop Stubbs; but that is for Edward I., a century later than the period we are considering. The Pipe Roll of 2 Hen. II. gives a revenue of only £22,000; that of 1 Ric. I. of £50,000. The last is too large, as it contains the new and extra aids given to the King on his accession. It would be safe, I fancy, to take £35,000 as the average

revenue, so that the Jewish contribution was about one-twelfth of the whole.

JEWISH POPULATION.—It would be, of course, of interest to ascertain the number of Jews in England during the twelfth century, but the materials at our disposal are scarcely adequate for the purpose. I have compiled a list of all the names mentioned in the records, and this runs to some 750. But these are of various generations, and were not all living simultaneously, nor do they give more than the heads of families. If we divide them into four generations—(1) 1100-1153 A.D., (2) 1154-1173, (3) 1174-1193, (4) 1194-1206, a rough calculation gives 15, 45, 300, 390, as the approximative number of names *known* in each generation, and indicates rather our relative knowledge of the various periods than the actual population. For the fourth period we are lucky in possessing a name-list of the Jews subscribing to the ransom of Richard I. at Northampton in 1194. This gives nearly 270 names of heads of families throughout the country. As, however, the sum voted was 5,000 marks (£3,666), and the sums mentioned in the roll reach only about £1,800, it is probable that it contains only the better half of the whole collection. As a matter of fact, for many of the towns I could supplement the list considerably. Altogether, I reckon that some 500 Jewish families were at that date, 1194, in England, probably amounting to some 2,000 souls. In the preceding generation their numbers were probably equally great, but the natural increase was cut short by the massacres of 1190, which probably removed nearly 500 victims. The Jewish accounts give 150 as the number killed in York; Ralph Disset mentions 57 slain at Bury St. Edmund's, and the *émeutes* at London, Lynn, Norfolk, and Stamford must have largely increased the total.

I do not think the total number can have much exceeded 2,000, at this time, as the total population of England seems not to have been greater than a million and a-half,

and it does not seem likely that this small population could have maintained much more than one per cent. of bankers or "usurers," especially as most of the business of the country was performed by barter. As it was, the resources of the country must have been severely taxed to support such a large number of unproductive persons, though incidentally the banking facilities they offered may have encouraged trade in the building of castles, convents, &c.

We may from the list enumerate, at any rate, the English towns where Jews are known to have existed in the twelfth century, with the number of Jews occurring in my Name-list in each case:—

110, London.	5, Stamford.
82, Lincoln.	4, Hertford.
42, Norwich.	3, Dunstable, Ipswich,
40, Gloucester.	Leicester, Rising,
39, Northampton.	Wallingford.
36, Winchester.	2, Beverley, Birdfield,
32, Cambridge.	Bonham, Doncas-
22, Oxford.	ter, Eye, Lynn,
18, Bristol.	Newport, Roches-
16, Colchester.	ter.
14, Chichester.	1, Arundel, Devizes,
13, Bedford, York.	Faversham, Finch-
12, Canterbury, Worces-	lefield, Grimsby,
ter.	Hamton, New-
11, Hertford.	land, Newcastle,
9, Bungay, Exeter.	Reading, Thetford,
7, Nottingham.	Wells, Westminster,
6, Edmondsbury.	Wilton, Windsor.

The comparative density of the Jewish population follows the density of the general population, being thickest in the South and East, sparsest in North and West.

THE JEWS' HOUSES.—It is rare, even in conservative England, for a private dwelling-house to exist, in however battered a condition, after so long a period as seven centuries. This is specially the case with private houses, as the large majority of them were constructed of wood, as London knew to its cost in the great fire of 1136. But the twelfth century was the beginning of better days in domestic architecture, and stone houses for private dwellings practically date from this period. Among the earliest to use the new luxury—for luxury it was—were the Jews. It is by no means accidental that three out of the scanty remains of the domestic architecture of the twelfth century are known as “Jews’ houses.” There are two at Lincoln and one at Bury St. Edmund’s.

Of the two at Lincoln, that in the High Street is the better known, and has frequently been described, among others, by Turner, in the first volume of his *Domestic Architecture*, pp. 7, 41, from whom I derive the following details:—The principal dwelling-room was on the first floor, probably for protection. The fireplace is on the side towards the street, the chimney being corbelled out over the door, the lower part of it, with the corbels, forming a sort of canopy over the doorway. This is richly decorated, the ornamentation being similar to that of Bishop Alexander’s work in Lincoln Cathedral. Some of the windows are good Norman ones, of two lights, with a shaft between. The staircase seems to have been internal, and the house is small, of two rooms only. All authorities on architecture date it as of the twelfth century, though historically it is connected with the name of a Lincoln Jewess, named Belaset of Wallingford, who was hanged for clipping the coinage a few years before the Expulsion. It is, however, similar in style and appearance to what the other Jew’s house of Lincoln must have been.

This is of far more historic interest, and has the advantage that it can be definitely dated. It is situated on the Steep Hill, at Lincoln, on the right-hand side going up, and

tradition has always associated the house with the name of Aaron of Lincoln, the great Jewish financier of the twelfth century, who died in 1187. Unfortunately the building suffered much at the hands of successive tenants; the roof, some of the windows, the doors, and most of the walls have been restored; all the rest is the original house. This consists chiefly of a window, similar in every way to those of Belaset's house, and an external chimney projecting over the doorway in much the same way. Turner remarks that a Norman ornamented string, on a level with the floor, may be traced along two sides of the house. I have had it photographed and engraved for my forthcoming book. It is undoubtedly the earliest historic building of Jewish interest in England.

Moyse Hall, at Bury St. Edmund's, is also called the Jews' Synagogue in local tradition. It is of late Norman, partly of Transition character, the lower story being vaulted, while the arch-ribs are pointed. This also appears to have had no windows on the ground floor. On the upper floor there are two good Transition Norman windows, each of two lights, square-headed and plain, under a round arch, with mouldings and shafts in the jambs, having capitals of almost Early English character. Internally the masonry is not carried up all the way to the sill of the window, so that a bench of stone is formed on each side of it. It is an early instance of the square-headed window, divided by a mullion under a semicircular arch. Some antiquaries believe that the building once possessed a tower. It was used last century as a bridewell, and is still in use as a police station. It is possible, I think, that it was used as a school, having just the arrangement, in two storeys, contemplated by the code of the period. If so, it is the earliest school building in existence in the country, as the Jews were expelled from Bury St. Edmund's in 1190.

The historians of the period refer to the luxurious character of the Jews' houses of the time, those of Joco

and Benedict, the chief Jews of York, being likened to residences of princes. Their solid character may have been intended for safety as much as for luxury, and they resisted the attacks of the rioters in the *émeutes* of 1189-90, till fire was set to their thatched roofs.

THE YORK RIOTS.—The outbreak of fanatic fury against the Jews of England during the winter and spring of 1189-90, was the most striking incident in the mediæval history of the English Jews. And of the whole series of incidents the most striking episode was the sublime self-sacrifice of the York Jews, which was the final act of the tragedy. There was a dignified sense of personal honour shown in the attitude of the besieged that recalls the heroes of antiquity. Observers at the time recognised the analogy with the last days of Jerusalem, and the comparison does not strike one as incongruous, looking back upon the scene across the centuries. Men who could dare so greatly for an ideal cause, men who could die rather than forswear their faith, must have been something other than mere greedy usurers.

We have very full accounts of the tragedy, the fullest being written by William of Newbury, who was himself a Yorkshireman, who lived and died at Bridlington within eight years of the tragedy. He is, strictly speaking, a contemporary witness, and was fully conscious of the importance and significance of the story he was telling. Yet notwithstanding the detail with which he writes, there are not a few points which remain doubtful, while the whole inner history of the tragedy has to be sought for in the significance of the names of the murderers given in the records.

The actual scene of the final act of self-sacrifice can scarcely be doubted, though it is by no means distinctly described by the historian, who speaks as if it were the whole of York Castle that was held by the Jews. Yet it is unlikely that the sheriff should have handed over to the

Jews the custody of the whole castle, which would involve withdrawing the garrison. It is much more probable that he set aside the isolated outwork known as Clifford's Tower for their reception. This was a building erected on a high mound, and strongly fortified; tradition has it that it was built by the Conqueror (Drake, *Ebor.*, p. 289). It was originally of two stories, but the interior was blown up in 1687, and is now in ruins. This, by its isolation and impregnable position, was the most suitable place of safety for the Jews. But if so, their numbers could scarcely have been so great as 500, which William of Newbury fixes upon, since so large a number could not have been easily received within Clifford's Tower. I am confirmed in this correction of William of Newbury's figures by the more moderate estimate of Ephraim of Bonn, who in the Hebrew martyrology which he wrote fixes the number at 150. It is probable enough that he had before him an actual list of the martyrs, and it is not impossible that the York *Memorbuch*, as such lists are called in Germany, may be found. At present we know only four names: Joce the head of the York Jews, Anna his wife, R. Yomtob of Joigny, who, as Ephraim of Bonn informs us, was martyred at York (Aborak he calls it), and R. Elias, who is mentioned in the Tosaphoth (Joma 27^a, Sebach 14^b) as the martyr of Aborak, *i.e.*, Everwic or Eboracum, the original name of York. There can be little doubt that R. Yomtob of Joigny was "the elder from beyond the sea," who had so much authority with the York Jews, and counselled them to slay themselves rather than disown their faith. The speech given by William of Newbury is probably fictitious, after the manner of Livy; he owns indebtedness to Josephus for the idea. But some such stirring address would be consonant with Yomtob's skill as a Hebrew writer. This is proved by the fact that even to this day, the most striking hymn of the Day of Atonement service—that beginning with כָּן אָמַנְךָ and ending each verse with the refrain כְּלָחָרִי, "I have forgiven"—was written by Yomtob of York. He is

frequently mentioned in the Tosaphoth (see Zunz *Zur Gesch.*, 52), and was clearly one of the most distinguished Jews of North Europe in the twelfth century—a fitting person to form the central figure in the most striking episode of Jewish history in that century.

Of the rioters and their leaders we know far more, thanks to the fulness of the public records of the period. I have discovered in the Pipe Rolls (No. 102, 2 Ric. I., Everwich) the names of fifty-one prominent citizens of York who were fined altogether 342 marks (£228) for complicity in the riots. But another item (124) gives us more important information as to the leaders of the whole movement, whose lands were seized by William Longchamp when he visited York in the Easter of 1190 with a large force (costing £60, Pipe Roll, 1 Ric. I., Everwich) to punish the rioters, and bring back to London the few Jews who remained alive after the catastrophe (their transport cost only 8s., P. R., item 96). Their names were Richard Malebisse, Kt., and his squires, Walter de Carton and Richard de Cuckney, Sir William de Percy and Picot de Percy, Roger de Ripun and Alan Malekake. To these names the Meaux Chronicle (ed. Bond. i., 155) adds those of Philip de Fauconbridge and Marmaduke Darell. To readers of the nineteenth century these names would be names and nothing more. But to Bishop Stubbs, who has lived as much in the twelfth as in the nineteenth century, the names implied much more, and have suggested the clue to the whole riot. For he found several of the names associated together in Dugdale and other Cartularies, and observed that some of them were connected with the Percy and Pudsey families, who were then the ruling spirits of the North Countrie (see his note on Roger Howden, Vol. III., p. xlv.). Following up the hint thus given, I have further extended the evidence of the close connection of these various names in Dugdale's *Monasticon* (D.) and Whitby (W.), and Finchdale Cartularies (F.) published by the Surtees Society. Thus Alan Malekake

occurs as a co-signatory with Malebysse (W. No. cxii., p. 95), and with Picot de Percy (F. x., p. 10), who elsewhere signs with Malebysse (F. xvi.). Richard de Kakenai (mis-spelt Kadenai) signs with both Picot and Alan (F. xxii.), while we know he was squire to Richard Malebysse, with whom, and with Picot de Percy, he signs F. No. lxii. Then the Fauconbridges had inter-married with the De Cuckneys (D. vi., 873), while Agnes Percy gives a manor "nepoti meo Ric. Malebysse" (D. v., 513). And almost all these deeds are connected with the wide-reaching transactions of the Pudsey family, who followed the lead of Hugh Pudsey, the masterful old Prince-Bishop of Durham (Norgate, *England under the Angevin Kings*, ii., 283, *seq.*).

There was another bond between these men which had a more direct bearing on the York tragedy. The Percy family were in debt to the Jews; Richard Percy yielded two bovates of land to Whitby Abbey for assistance afforded him in releasing him and his lands "de Judaismo" (W. No. cccxxxiv., p. 387), and he was directly connected with Malebysse (D. iv., 75, W. 293 n.). The Darells again were equally embarrassed, as we learn from the Meaux Chronicle (i., 315). About the leader of the whole attack, Richard Malebysse, the man specially mentioned by William of Newbury as the leader, we have much more explicit information as to his indebtedness to the Jews. As early as 1182 we find a receipt of Solomon of Paris, acting on behalf of Aaron of Lincoln, of £4 "out of the great debt which he owes to my master Aaron" (Brit. Mus. Add. Chart., 1251), though he had only come into his property six years before (Pipe Roll, 22 Hen. II., Honour of Eye). By a kind of premonition, Solomon of Paris, in the Hebrew receipt with which he endorses the Latin document (Davis, *Shetaroth*, 288) punningly translates his name, *חיה רעה*, Evil Beast, anticipating William of Newbury, who refers to him as "Ricardus vero cognomine Mala Bestia."

William of Newbury distinctly states that the riots were instigated by a number of the nobles who were heavily indebted to the Jews, or were pressed by the Royal Treasury, which had taken up the debts to deceased Jews. The final act of the tragedy was the rush to the Minster, where the deeds of the Jews had been sent, probably for safety; these were sacrilegiously burned within the precincts of the Minster itself. We may conjecture that the real object of the siege of Clifford's Tower was to get possession of these deeds. Only after the tragedy did the besiegers learn, probably from one of the few surviving Jews, that their trouble had been useless, and that the deeds were at the Minster. Thither they rushed and effected the main object of the riot by destroying the evidence of their indebtedness to the hated Jews. Even this was in vain, for duplicates existed elsewhere, and we find several instances of indebtedness to Joce and others of the slain Jews of York long after the massacre (P. R., items, Nos. 109, 121). The debts fell into the King's hands as universal legatee of the martyrs.

Though it was undoubtedly a deliberate plan of the leaders to get rid of their indebtedness to the Jews, the York riot would not have been possible but for the religious prejudices of the mob, upon which they played. These had been raised to fever heat by the enthusiasm for the Third Crusade, on which Richard Cœur-de-Lion was just starting. It was possible that even the leaders of the riot were combining business and religion in their attack on the Jews. They were all connected with various abbeys, and their names occur in the Abbey Cartularies, as we have seen. The Fauconbridges were the great patrons of the Abbey of Welbeck, and Malebyse himself was afterwards the founder of Newbo, co. Lincoln. This religious side of the attack was led by a white-robed monk of the Premonstratensian order, who was the most conspicuous figure in the attack throughout the two or three days it lasted. Now Welbeck was one of the few Premonstratensian abbeys in England,

and it is not stretching the point too far to suggest that this monk was a relation of the Fauconbridges, or perhaps of the De Cuckneys, Cuckney being a village near Welbeck. It was the death of this monk that exasperated the leaders so much and gave an incentive to the final cruel and treacherous scenes.

The punishment inflicted upon the rioters was by no means adequate to their offence. Richard was doubly incensed, at the loss to the Royal Treasury, and the offence to the royal dignity. And his Chancellor, William Longchamp, undertook the task of punishment with the more zeal, as the leaders were, as we have seen, all of the party of Hugh Pudsey, Bishop of Durham, and Longchamp's chief rival (Norgate, *l.c.* ii., 286). But Longchamp's rule was short, and Prince John reinstated Pudsey, and we find immediately afterwards Richard Malebyse restored to his forest rights, and even by paying a fine was granted possession of his land taken from him by the king (P.R., item 124).

Of Richard Malebyse's after fate we have abundant evidence; it was uniformly successful to the end, one regrets to observe. In 1200 he gets warren for his land at Acastre, Cemannsthorp, Scalton, and Alby (Rot. Lit. Cl., 51*b*). A year later, we find him making arrangements about other lands in Marton and Tolesby, Newenham, Baggely, Scalton, Halmby, Dale. He obtains "rectum frussiandi" in Usan and Coldric (*Oblates*, p. 55, cf. 379). These and other places mentioned in Pipe Rolls 3 and 10, Ric. I. (Gatesbris, Kepwick, Torinton, Steniton) are all in Yorkshire, and one of them to this day preserves, written as it were on English soil, a record of the arch villain of the York tragedy in the village of Acaster MALBIS, five miles south of York.

He was clearly a large landed proprietor, and it is not surprising to find him sent as ambassador to the King of Scots in 1200 (Close Roll, p. 99), and appointed Chief Justice of the York Assize, 4 Jo. (Foster, *Yorkshire Pedigrees*, "Beckwith of Clint"), and he showed his zeal for religion

by founding the monastery of Newbo, co. Lincoln, in 1198. He had sons who succeeded him, but the family ultimately were incorporated, by a female descendant, into that of the Beckwiths of Clint.

Yet he did not go altogether unpunished for his dastardly attack on a set of defenceless and harmless strangers. It was for money that he planned the deed, and in his hopes of freeing himself from debt to the Jews he was disappointed. As late as 1205 we find him being freed from all usuries to the Jews while he was in the King's service (Close Roll, 58*b*), probably in Scotland, whither he was sent as ambassador as we have seen.

The York riot is the central fact in the pre-expulsion history of the Jews of England. Their position worsened from that date till their expulsion one hundred years later. Yet it was a scene in which the Jews came out in far brighter colours than their enemies, animated as they were by the highest motives, while the besiegers of Clifford's Tower were mainly, as we have seen, animated by a desire to evade their just debts.

ISAAC OF YORK.—In 1864 a great "find" of 6,000 of what are called "short-cross" pennies (silver) was made at Eccles. These are so called to distinguish them from the later long-cross pennies where the cross on the reverse of the coin reaches the rim, so as to enable clipping to be easily detected. This expedient was adopted in 1247, so that the short-cross pennies are prior to that date. Their peculiarity is, however, that they all bear the head and superscription of Henry II., none being known with those of Richard or John. It is clear that Henry's name and counterfeit presentment was used on the coins of his two sons. The distinguishing mark of the coinage consists in the name of the moneyer, which is invariably placed on the reverse; there are no less than 240 different names included in the Eccles find from about twenty local mints. (See the list in the late W. S. W. Vaux's Paper on the

Eccles find, *Numismatic Chronicle*, New Series, V., pp. 219-254.)

From the large number and variety of the coins in the Eccles find, Dr. (now Sir) John Evans was enabled to make a number of inductions, which gave an almost complete answer to what has been known among English numismatists as "The Short Cross Question" (*Numism. Chron.*, l.c., pp. 219-254). From certain minute variations in the effigy of Henry II. on the coins, arrangement of hair, etc., he was enabled to distinguish five different types, ranging from 1180 to 1247, while from the few names of moneyers known from the Records, Pipe Rolls, etc., he was enabled to distinguish the chronological sequence of the types. Besides this, he determined the date of an earlier find of 6,000 pennies of Henry II. at Tealby described in *Archæologia* xviii., 1-8 as being from the earliest dies of Henry's reign, and dating therefore from 1158-70. His investigations have since 1865, the date of his Paper, been regarded as decisive and epochmaking.

Among the coins in the Eccles find were several with the moneyer's name ISAD ON æVÆRWID, Isaac of (on) Everwic or York. Mr. Hubert Hall, in his *Court Life under the Plantagenets*, has regarded this moneyer as a Jew, and the question is of the greater interest owing to the coincidence of the name with that chosen by Sir Walter Scott for the principal Jew in his *Ivanhoe*. The point in favour of the identification, besides the probability of a connection between Jews and money, is the Biblical name, but these were by no means uncommon among Englishmen. At any rate, if this is to be considered at all decisive, it seems worth while considering it with the other Biblical or Jewish-looking names among the moneyers whose names are found on the short-cross pennies among Mr. Vaux's and Sir J. Evans's lists: they are as follows, placing them in alphabetical order, with the inscription and place of coinage, together with the types of coinage with which each name is associated. I. refers to coins minted 1180-90;

II., 1190-1205; III., IV., 1205-1216; V., 1216-47. It is obviously only the first two of these types which concern us here.

BENQIT	ON	LVND	London	II.
DAVI	„	QVQRWID	York	II. III. IV
DAVI	„	LVND	London	II.
ISAD	„	QVQRWID	York	I.
NIDHOL	„	QANT	Canterbury	IV. V.
NIDOL	„	LYN	Lynn	III.
NIDOL	„	EVERWID	York	III.
SAMVQL	„	QANT	Canterbury	II. III. IV.
SALQMV	„	QANT	„	III.
SIMON	„	DIQ	Chichester	III. V.
SIMVN	„	QANT	Canterbury	II. III. IV. V.

Now if these were all Jews it would be strange if we could not identify some of them at least with the names mentioned in the Records. There is a Benedict of London mentioned in Richard of Anesty's account, c. 1160. There is a Josce fil David of London mentioned in the first list of London Jews, 1186. There is an Isaac fil Mosse of York mentioned in the Pipe Rolls, 3 Ric. I., and an Isaac Blund of York mentioned in the Fine Rolls of 1205. There is a Samuel fil Jacob of Canterbury mentioned in the Northampton Donum of 1194, as well as a Simon, nephew of Jacob of Canterbury. But none of these are mentioned as "monetarii," and it was a law of Henry I. "Quod nullus ausus sit cambire denarios nisi monetarius regis" (Ruding, *Annals of Coinage*, ii. 138). Not a single one of the names can, therefore, be identified with any probability with the name of a known Jew of the twelfth century, and the possibility of any single one of them being a Jew is almost annihilated by this fact.¹ I think we may take it for granted that a Jew could not be a moneyer. The reason was, I imagine,

¹ None of the 92 moneyers whose names are mentioned as occurring on the coins found at Tealby (*Archæologia*, l.c.) are at all Jewish. This, however, might be merely due to the less importance of the Jews in the earlier part of Henry II's reign (1158-70) and is so far a point in favour of the later names being those of Jews.

that moneyers had to take the oath of fealty (Sir John Evans, *l.c.*, p. 290), and this included a Christian formula which a Jew could not take. The whole inquiry throws light on a mysterious passage of the Pipe Roll for 27 Hen. II., in which Isaac of Rochester and Isaac of Russia (Isaac of Tchernigoff mentioned by the author of the *Sepher Hashoham*), and Isaac of Beverley are fined because they are said to have exchanged or minted (*cambivisse*). The former could not well be an offence, but the latter was, according to the law of Henry II. quoted above from Ruding, and we may be tolerably certain that none of the three Isaacs or any other Jew would be allowed to mint, possibly for fear of false coinage. The whole investigation proves, I think, that we may nail the so-called Jewish coins of Isaac of York to the counter of numismatic inquiry.

I may add that Scott was unfortunate in naming his chief Jewish character Isaac of York, as at the time at which he places the action of his novel, viz.: in 1194, the date of Richard's return, there were no Jews at York, owing to the scare caused by the massacre of 1190. They are conspicuous by their absence from the list of names of the contributories to the Northampton Donum. Rebecca also was a name unknown among English Jewesses of the twelfth century, the nearest approach being Biket, a servant in London, 1186. Kirjath Jearim, the name of one of the minor Jews, is the name of a town not of a person, and, as Mr. Abrahams has shown, was taken from Marlowe's "Jew of Malta."

JOSEPH JACOBS.
